

# The Republican.

---

No. 4. Vol. 14.] LONDON, Friday, Aug. 4, 1826. [PRICE 6d.

---

## EMANCIPATION.

---

WE can not recur too often to this subject. We stand in need of all sorts of emancipation. Emancipation from our vices, from our prejudices, from some of our passions, from our enemies, from our friends, from wives, from husbands, from children, from parents, from lovers, from haters, from diseases and lastly from life. The cry of reform has yielded to that of emancipation; but each implies that wrongs exist. Life, society, marriage, parentage, education, law and custom are all so many sorts of mancipation or slavery, and emancipation seems only to be found in the extinction of life. The Roman Catholics of Great Britain roar for emancipation from certain laws, while their real mancipation would remain in the foundation of that religious system and those tenets which distinguish them from other sects. Man cannot be reformed by others; he must reform himself: and the aggregate of individual reform will constitute all desirable general reforms. Man cannot be emancipated by others, he must emancipate himself, where ill-grounded tenets and attachments enslave him. To cease to be a slave, man must form a strong and individual mind. If he fail to do this, such a mind will always, in some measure, be his master and make him comparatively a slave.

It is the property of matter, of each identity of matter, to prey upon whatever surrounds it. This is nature. And with regard to man, nature is only to be corrected by a benevolent disposition, to be formed by education or adopted as a pleasure. In nature, there is no intelligence to direct or to correct its consequences, and all correction desirable to man must be made by the intelligence of man, by his labour, his caution, his art, and his industry. All depends on himself: he alone can emancipate himself from momentary natural oppressions.

Daily do we hear the complaints of the Roman Catholics as to their political condition; but if they will take a lesson from my state and example, they may learn that emancipation, in all general cases, is a matter of individual exertion. I have emancipated myself from all political grievances that applied to my espousal

---

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 62, Fleet Street.

of certain opinions. Each Roman Catholic can do this for himself, while the body, by its meetings, its delarations, its resolutions, its protests, its menaces, its prayers, its promises, can do nothing. All its words and deeds become vapour and do but irritate and strengthen the hostile party. The opinions of the Roman Catholic have the sanction of ages, while mine are comparatively novel and established themselves in the first solid act of resistance to opposition. The difference between us is, that the Roman Catholic fails in his claims by discouraging discussion, while I have succeeded by making it most free. Let the Roman Catholics call for and practice the most free discussion and they will soon succeed in their emancipation. Discussion is a matter in which each individual can act and judge for himself, and it is the only source for the establishment of individual mind.

In the way of mental or political emancipation, the legislature can do nothing more than remove penalties and encourage discussion. This should be done in all cases of opinion or political and religious doctrine, because discussion will rectify these matters much better than the penalties of the legislature can possibly do. The most violent, the most absurd doctrines will do no mischief, if exposed to the immediate correction of free discussion. The actions and morals of a man want but little more restraint than free exposure and free discussion. Free discussion and free exposure of conduct will produce mind and bring about individual reform, beyond whatever a legislature can do in the matter: and emancipation will only be found in the power of mind that results from discussion.

As a proof that a man can only be emancipated from his prejudices by reasoning upon them, we have an instance in the conduct of Mr. Cobbett. He has uniformly denounced what he calls *the free trade project*; but in the sixth paragraph of his late petition to the king, which accompanies this article, we find, that, on reasoning on the means of relieving the distresses of the people, he hits on this *free trade project* as one of the main remedies. A few months back, he declared, by both tongue and pen, that *two nations could not trade together and both gain*, he denounced the notion as most absurd; and here, after thinking of the matter, and of a remedy for the distress of the labourer, he finds, that two nations can trade together, and not only gain, but that each can keep a large portion of the people of the other from starving. I have printed his petition as a proof of his late ignorance and present improvement.

Reader, have you vices, have you prejudices, have you fears, have you errors, determine to reason upon them, and to wear them down to the standard of universal opinion, by speaking dogmatically only of that of which you have a knowledge; by listening patiently to, and considering well, every objection to your conclusions that can be advanced by any person; deem no



man presumptuous for contradicting you, it is a proof of his independence and good spirit; and, above all things, ask yourself, when you cannot agree with another on a given subject, if it be not possible, that you, a fallible being, might be in error, instead of your opponent. Observe these rules in your discussions, and you will soon emancipate yourself from whatever is disagreeable in society.

RICHARD CARLILE.

---

## MR. COBBETT'S ACCOUNT

OF HIS

### VISIT TO THE KING'S COTTAGE.

BEING wholly unacquainted with the hours of rising, and so forth, at the King's Cottage, I went to Windsor, where I arrived about eight o'clock on Saturday morning. I knew there was a gentleman there who regularly attended in order to supply the "Court News;" and I thought he was a likely person to give me the information that I wanted. Having learnt from this gentleman that the hour of twelve, or thereabouts, was the proper time to attend, I proceeded from Windsor to the Cottage, so as to arrive at that hour, or thereabouts.

When I spoke to the Court News Writer, whose name is Dowsett, I told him my business; I told him that I wished to present a petition to the King, and that my intention was to send a note to the Marquess of Conyngham, in order that he might put me in the way of doing it in a proper manner. Towards the Cottage I went, then, in my chaise, with my note (No. I.) for Lord Conyngham ready written. The Cottage is in the midst of a little wood, surrounded, wood and all, with a high paling, there being a gate and a porter's lodge to keep a passage open through this high fence. This fence, or line of circumvallation, is an interior line, there being another line of circumvallation drawn round this interior line, and at a considerable distance from it. This exterior line has a gate, and, indeed, it has several gates to let people in and out at. At this outer gate there is a park-keeper, dressed in green, and there is a sort of rural sentry-box in the inside of the gate.

When I came to this outside gate, the keeper asked me who I was going to see, or who I had business with at the Cottage? I told him with Lord Conyngham. He hesitated a little before he opened the gate, looking hard at me, and observing that the usual way was to send in a message, or letter, or whatever it was. I, without appearing to pay much attention to what he said, bid him to open the gate, which he did, but then I said to him, "I want to have this note sent in to my Lord Conyngham, while I wait for an answer;" upon my asking him to do it, he, with great civility, took the note from me in order to carry it in, or to cause it to be delivered to Lord Conyngham. He went on before me, and I followed with my chaise; but we now came to what I was not aware of, namely, the gate in the second line of circumvallation. That gate was not open, though the porter, indeed, was there, and standing by the gate. Here, also, I found Mr. Dowsett, whom I had seen at Windsor. Now, when I mentioned

my business to Mr. Dowsett at Windsor, he asked me if he should apprise Lord Conyngham of it, as he (Mr. Dowsett) should be at the Cottage before me. I said "No," because there could be nothing to justify me in sending such a message to Lord Conyngham; but I knew very well that Mr. Dowsett would tell his Lordship that I was coming; and, the fact is, though I did not think it right for me to send a message, I thought it was right, and for my own credit, that his Lordship should be apprized beforehand, if I could with propriety cause it to be done; because, otherwise, it might have appeared that I was desirous of getting in slyly, and taking his Lordship by surprise.

Mr. Dowsett did then tell Lord Conyngham that I was coming, and that I was coming with a petition to the King; and, now, Mr. Dowsett I found at the gate, in the interior line of circumvallation, prepared to inform me, which he did, that Lord Conyngham was GONE OUT; that it was impossible to say when he would return; and that Lord Conyngham had directed him, Mr. Dowsett, to inform me, when I should arrive, that, if I would leave my petition with him, Mr. Dowsett, he, Lord Conyngham, would take care that it should go through the proper channel.

I, however, took the note from the Park keeper and gave it to Mr. Dowsett, requesting him to carry it to Lord Conyngham, and to bring me an answer of some sort or another, giving him clearly to understand that I was resolved not to go away without some answer or other to that note.

Mr. Dowsett took the note. The cottage gate, at which I was, is situated at about 400 yards from the cottage itself; so that to go backward and forward could not be a work of more than ten minutes, that being at the rate of only three miles an hour, yet Mr. Dowsett was absent three quarters of an hour, though he found Lord Conyngham at the cottage. However, he brought me a verbal answer from Lord Conyngham, which answer is stated in the note No. 2. When I had written that note, and given it to Mr. Dowsett to carry to Lord Conyngham, I returned to London.

As I think that these particulars are of some interest to the public, especially as connected with the Petition which it is my desire to present to the King, I enclose the whole of the documents to you. I think it right to add, however, that the presenting of this Petition, though an object, in my estimate of the matter, fully justifying my requesting an audience of the King, was not the only object I had in view. My intention was, and indeed my resolution was, to tell his Majesty of many things, of which I am pretty sure he never yet heard one word. It was my resolution to tell him the naked truth, with regard to the measures which I deem absolutely necessary to be adopted, to save the country from a terrific convulsion. It was my resolution to tell him, upon this subject, that which I would have told the Parliament, if I had not been kept out of Parliament. Now, then, I have done, up to this moment, every thing that it has been in my power to do. There remains but one thing more, at any rate; and that one thing I shall endeavour to do in the course of a few weeks; it is, to get together the people of Westminster, or of the County of Middlesex, and to induce them, if I can, to join the people of the North, in praying for Reform, and for a total repeal and abolition of the Corn Laws.

I am, Sir, your most obedient and most humble servant,  
WM. COBBETT.



## No. I.

"Royal Cottage-gate, Windsor Park, July 29, 1826.

"MY LORD—I have a petition now with me, which I think it my bounden duty to present, in person, to his Majesty the King. The law tells me that I have 'a right to petition the King:' my own judgment tells me that the subject of my petition is of the greatest and most pressing importance to the well-being of the King's subjects, and to the tranquillity of the kingdom. I therefore request your Lordship to have goodness to apply, in that manner of which you are the best judge, for permission that I may, with all the humility that becomes me, discharge, towards his Majesty and my country, that sacred duty, a deep sense of which alone could have induced me to give your Lordship this trouble.

"I am, with the greatest respect, my Lord,

"Your Lordship's most obedient and most humble servant,

"WM. COBBETT.

"The Most Noble the Marquess Conyngham."

## No. II.

"Royal Cottage-gate, Windsor Park,  
29th July (afternoon), 1826.

"MY LORD—Mr. Dowsett has just informed me that your Lordship, upon receiving the note which I had the honour, this day at noon, to address to your Lordship, directed him to tell me, from your Lordship, that you had read my note, and that you were ready to receive any paper that I wished to have delivered to his Majesty; and that you would, upon being informed of my address in town, cause to be sent to me an answer to any paper that I might leave.

"I lament exceedingly, my Lord, that there should be any obstruction to the presenting of my petition to his Majesty. The law, my Lord, the rights of Englishmen, know of no obstruction to petition the King. However, I have done all that I am able to do towards a due discharge of my duty as a faithful subject of his Majesty. I would fain do more; but I cannot, without an abandonment of my own rights, consent to deliver my petition into the hands of any person, however respectable, who is the bearer of a mere verbal message from your Lordship.

"I am, with the greatest respect, my Lord,

"Your Lordship's most obedient and humble servant,

"WM. COBBETT.

"The Most Noble the Marquess Conyngham."

## No. III.

*To his most gracious Majesty George the Fourth, King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."*

The Petition of his Majesty's dutiful subject, William Cobbett, of Kensington, in the County of Middlesex, dated this 25th July, 1826.

MOST HUMBLY SHOWS,

1. THAT, though your Petitioner has, in common with the rest of the

people of this kingdom, an undoubted right to petition your Majesty, his profound veneration for your Majesty's person and office, his great fear of being deemed presumptuous, together with that diffidence which conscious inability bids him feel, would, under circumstances less imperious, have effectually restrained him from entertaining the thought of thus approaching your Majesty, but that, having recently witnessed the cruel sufferings, and heard the bitter complaints of your Majesty's ingenious, industrious, enterprising, public-spirited, loyal, and every way excellent subjects in the northern manufacturing counties, having had ample opportunities of ascertaining the causes of those sufferings; having contemplated the imminent public dangers that may arise from the want of relief from sufferings so acute and irritating in their nature, and pervading such immense numbers of people; having maturely considered of the means of alleviating the sufferings, and of, at least, lessening the danger; having, for many months, anxiously waited, in the vain expectation that your Majesty's Ministers would adopt some measure of real relief; and having, at last, reluctantly come, in common with his fellow-subjects in general, to the firm persuasion that those Ministers, either from want of sufficient knowledge in such matters, or from another more easily divined than safely defined cause, have not duly informed your Majesty of the abovementioned sufferings and dangers, and that they have not in contemplation any remedy commensurate with the magnitude of the evils; knowing these facts, and entertaining these opinions, your humble Petitioner could not, without a cowardly abandonment of his duty, refrain from making, though at the risk of incurring the displeasure of your Ministers, this appeal to the wisdom, the justice, the patient attention, the humane, and paternal feelings of your Majesty.

2. That, thus urged on by a sense of duty towards your Majesty and his country, your Petitioner will now, with all deference and humility, proceed, first, to endeavour to describe the situation of your unhappy people, and especially of those in manufacturing counties; next, to state the causes of their sufferings; and, lastly, to point out the means of an immediate mitigation, at least, of these sufferings.

3. That, as to the situation of the people, it may be truly said that all those who do not share, directly or indirectly, in the taxes, are, in a greater or less degree, either suffering, or on the point of suffering; that a great part of the merchants and traders have already been ruined, and that a similar fate is reasonably anticipated by the rest; that, as undeniable proofs of the deplorable state of trade, commerce, and manufactures, there have been, in the last six months, 1641 bankrupts, being more than in any one former whole year; that the last six months have seen 3392 insolvent debtors enter the prison-doors, a number more than double that of any former whole year; and that the month of June alone saw 1153 insolvent debtors sent to prison, being, in one month, a number exceeding that of any whole year, until within the four years now last past; that property has long had, and now has, nothing like a fixed and permanent value; that, for a long while past, no man has been able to say whether he had property or not; that merchandise, to an immense amount, imported before last January, has fallen in value one half, after having paid a heavy duty; that a large part of these imported articles have been sold to foreigners at half the import prices; that having first paid one foreign nation for the raw material, our merchants were compelled to sell the raw material for half the cost to another foreign nation, thus enabling the latter to manufacture at our expence cheaper than ourselves; that all establishments, and all implements, and all materials, and stock in trade, com-



merce, and manufactures, have, in the course of the last eight months, fallen in nominal value more than one half; that the ship-owner, the merchant, the manufacturer, the shopkeeper, have, therefore, been unable to pay their debts, and have, accordingly, become bankrupts or insolvents; that while the whole of the middle class have been thus sinking in the scale of property, and while a large part of that class have been sinking into the class below them, that lower class have been gradually sinking, from a bare sufficiency of food and raiment, down to absolute hunger and nakedness; that the system of taxing, of funding, and of monopolies, has for many years been pressing down the working-class; that now, however, that class is reduced to a state of misery and degradation, that would almost seem to deny them the right of life and limb; that, with the exception of the unfortunate Irish, the English working-class have long been the poorest, the worst fed, the worst clad people in the whole world, of which their forefathers were the best fed, the best clad, and most happy; that of this mass of miserable beings, the working-class in the manufacturing counties are now the most miserable; that, at this moment, the question with thousands upon thousands probably is, whether it be better to die quietly with hunger, or to obtain food at the risk of the scaffold; and that, when the mind is once brought coolly to entertain this question, the law loses all its terrors, and even the sword gleams, and the cannon roars in vain.

4. That with regard to the causes of this deplorable state of things, your humble petitioner begs leave to state to your Majesty that it has not arisen from natural causes, but wholly from acts proposed by your Majesty's Ministers, and passed by the Parliament; that these causes are, first, enormous taxation—second, repeated and arbitrary changes in the value of money—and, third, the monopoly of the supply of corn, which monopoly is now pressing on the manufacturing class with peculiar force and severity; that, while it is notorious that a considerable part of the people are in danger of starving, while your Majesty's Ministers are urgently recommending charitable subscriptions, and are actually subscribing themselves, in order to prevent the people from dying with hunger; while these facts are notorious, it is not less notorious that these same Ministers are enforcing a law which imposes an enormous tax upon bread, and which, in fact, prevents an abundance of food from being brought into the country; so that, while the poor manufacturer receives a farthing in the shape of alms, a shilling, perhaps, is taken from him by the Corn Bill. That, at this time, wheat sells for about 20s. a quarter on the Continent of Europe, and flour for about 16s. a barrel at New York; that these prices, including all the charges of bringing the articles to England, are much less than half the present prices of our wheat and flour; that, therefore, when the working man pays a shilling for a loaf, he, as things now stand, pays, in fact, sixpence for bread, and sixpence for corn-tax, which corn-tax goes into the pockets of the landlords and of the beneficed clergy. That, besides this, the corn-tax leaves the people in general less money to expend on wearing apparel; that thus the manufacturers are injured by want of sale for their goods; and that on them, who are thus doubly and cruelly oppressed by this unnatural monopoly, a further and still greater injury and wrong is inflicted by the want of that export of manufactures which would take place in exchange for the corn and flour imported.

5. That such being the causes of the present distress, and of the daily increasing danger to the State, a general remedy must, to be efficacious, apply to the taxes, and also to the value of money, and must embrace extensive and equitable reforms and arrangements; that, however, as a special remedy, applicable to the particular and urgent case of the now suf-

fering manufacturing districts, a speedy repeal, and utter abolition of the Corn Bill, are loudly called for by sound policy, by bare justice to the industrious classes, by a due regard for the peace of the country, and by those feelings of humanity which the late gracious acts of your Majesty will, your humble petitioner would fain hope, tend, at last, to awaken in the breasts of the great owners of the land.

6. That, at this moment, this kingdom, once so great and so happy, exhibits to the world scenes such as your humble petitioner verily believes that that world never saw before; that, with feelings of the most profound respect, he beseeches your Majesty to behold our immense quantity of goods, made and making; then to be pleased to look at the foreign wheat and flour; then to be pleased to consider that the owners of the wheat and the flour want the goods, and the owners and makers of the goods want the wheat and flour; then to be pleased to hear the *law* say, that the wheat and the flour shall not come; that of course the goods shall not go, and that the makers of them shall die with hunger, or be degraded into paupers, while abundance of food is tendered them in fair exchange for their labour: and when your Majesty's gracious condescension shall have induced you further to observe that your people are afflicted with evil, the co-existence of which is wholly at variance, not only with all ordinary moral rules, but even with the laws of nature; when your Majesty shall be pleased to observe that, according to reports laid before, and to acts passed by the Parliament, your unhappy people are suffering, at one and the same moment, from hunger and from surplus produce—from nakedness and from a glut of clothing—from over-trading and over-working—and from want of trade and want of work—from panics occasioned by too much wealth, and by too much debt—from bankruptcy and insolvency, the fruit of unexampled prosperity—when your Majesty shall have observed these things, and shall, moreover, have been graciously pleased to reflect on the quantity of food and raiment consumed by the well-fed, well-clad, well-mounted troops, now stationed amongst the people, who and whose helpless children are half naked and crying for bread, partly, at least, in consequence of that Corn Bill, which was originally passed with soldiers drawn up round the Houses of Parliament; when your Majesty shall have been graciously pleased thus to behold, thus to observe, and thus to reflect, your humble petitioner will not doubt of a conviction in the mind of your Majesty that there is some great and radical error pervading the whole system of management of the affairs of your Majesty's now impoverished and sinking kingdom, and still less will he doubt of your Majesty's most anxious desire to apply to these evils a speedy and radical remedy.

7. That, therefore, your petitioner, emboldened by your Majesty's well-known indulgent disposition, presumes humbly to represent that, leaving, for the present, other matters aside, the heavy tax upon bread, so injurious to your Majesty's subjects in general, and so cruelly oppressive to the working, and especially to the manufacturing classes, operates exclusively to the benefit of the aristocracy, including the loan-makers and the beneficed clergy; that, for the sake of this class, so small in number, the millions of the community are, by the present system, doomed not only to incessant and uncompensated toil, but, in large part, to be placed in danger of perishing with hunger; that, in all sorts of ways, in places, in offices, in pensions, in sinecures, in grants, in emoluments, of every species, in advantages, direct and indirect, of every description and of every degree, has this class been favoured and enriched at the expence of the rest of the nation, who, for more than thirty years last past, has seen this one class engross a large part of the enormous taxes, and of the not less enormous loans, collected and raised within that period: that a very great portion of the land of this kingdom is owned by this class; that the ownership generally rests on grants from the Crown, or has been



acquired by means derived directly from the public taxes; and that now, in order to uphold the rents of this land, while all other property is fallen in value, foreign food is excluded from the country, though, in defiance of those principles of free trade, so recently applauded in the speeches of your Majesty, and though to the manifest injury of all the other classes of your Majesty's subjects, while amongst a large part of those unfortunate subjects, this selfish, and cruel, and insulting prohibition is, at this moment, producing all the horrors of pestilence and famine.

8. That your humble petitioner is one of those who suffer from these abuses and these evils; that experience has convinced him, that no remedy can be effectual, whether for relieving the people, or saving the state, until there shall be such a reform as shall enable the main body of your Majesty's subjects to secure themselves against the power of this particular class; that he deems it an undeniable fact, that the monopoly in corn is one great immediate cause of the present distresses and dangers, while it is evident to all the world that that monopoly springs from the self-interest of this particular and ever-encroaching class; and that, therefore, he humbly, but most earnestly prays, that your Majesty will be most graciously pleased to exert your royal prerogatives and authority in such way as shall tend to produce a radical reform of the Parliament, and as shall, with all possible speed, cause an importation of foreign food of every sort, free from all obstacles and from every species of tax.

And your Majesty's humble petitioner, as in duty bound,  
will ever pray,

WILLIAM COBBETT.

---

TO MR. CARLILE, EDITOR OF "THE REPUBLICAN."

---

SIR,

PERMIT me to offer a few remarks upon the article signed F. P., which appeared in your last, extracted from "The Trades" newspaper.

The able author of that article appears to be somewhat surprised that "even Mr. Thomas Single of Mile End has not been denied a place" in the columns of the above mentioned journal. I heartily thank the Editor for his impartiality: whether Single or Double or *Anatomie Vivante*, let every one be heard: let the circulation of opinions through the medium of the press be, as it is expressed by the public-spirited electors of Westminster, "free as the air we breathe."

Mr. Single may be wrong in his opinions; I know nothing of the letter in question but from F. P.'s reply; it has, however, at least done some good, in giving occasion for that reply. But is Mr. Single really so "ignorant," so "wayward," so much "the enemy of the improvement of the working classes," as he is represented by F. P.?—I think not. He may possibly want that happy fluency and clearness of expression, which characterize more experienced (and consequently better educated) writers, but is he altogether wrong in his statements and opinions upon the important subject of machinery? Let us examine the matter a little.

F. P. charges Mr. Single with asserting that the "scientific

knowledge and machinery have so reduced the quantity of labour, that men are starving from the want of work;" adding, "this either betrays great ignorance or great waywardness:" to which he subjoins, "I shall answer this assertion by another, namely, that in every branch of business, whatsoever, *without any exception*, scientific knowledge and machinery *have increased the whole quantity of employment.*"

I am not an enemy to machinery, under conditions which I shall hereafter name, but I think Mr. Single is right in this matter, to a certain extent, and consequently F. P. wrong.

"Without any exception whatever!" Here is scope enough, at any rate. Well then, I will take for instance, in the first place, the threshing machine. This overgrown implement will, with the assistance of one person, perform at least as much work as twenty flails, in the same space of time. Does this increase the whole quantity of employment in the agricultural department? Is there more wheat grown in consequence of this expeditious mode of threshing? Not a rood. There is also the hay-making machine, and there are twenty others, which perform full five times as much labour as could be done by manual exertion.

Secondly, Sir, I shall introduce you to the devil! Start not, I allude not to the arch fiend that tormented St. Dunstan, and still persecutes the saints, but to a machine under that appellation, which punishes journeymen rope-makers. This devil, with the assistance of nine persons, will manufacture a ship's cable, which formerly required the labour of eighty or ninety men. Does *this* increase the whole quantity of employment in the rope-making branch? Are there nine or ten times as many hemp-cables manufactured as formerly? Certainly not.

About nine years ago the journeymen rope-makers applied to me, in consequence of being thrown out of employment by this machine, to write a petition to the Honourable House of Commons, praying that a tax might be imposed upon the devil: I did so, and it was presented by Sir Robert Wilson; but the Honourable House did not see the necessity of setting its face against one who bore so portentuous a cognomen!

Thirdly, I shall instance the spinning machines. In my recollection, half the women and children in most villages in the kingdom were employed in spinning and winding cotton and woollen yarn. Do the spinning machines in the factories employ as many, or a quarter as many, hands as were employed by the spinning wheel? Impossible. Hundreds of industrious cottage wives have I seen, five and twenty or thirty years ago, trudging cheerfully to the shop with the produce of their and their children's industry, and returning laden with the sugar, and tea, and soap, and candles, and other little comforts which they are now obliged to forego entirely, for want of employment; while the children are running ignorant, dirty and naked, by the sides of our stage coaches,



tumbling and grinning like monkeys, to excite the charity of the passengers.

Then there are the power-looms. Is it not known that these machines will manufacture as many pieces of calico in a month as would formerly require a year with the same number of hands? Oh! but then we have so many more goods for exportation! Very true, so you have, and—are likely to *have* them. Many other facts might be cited to prove that machinery has *contributed* to the present want of employment; but I have neither time nor ability to go fully into the subject. If these hasty observations have the effect of inducing F. P. to explain more fully and clearly the results of his “extensive and long-continued inquiry,” I shall not have written in vain; for I feel confident that it is in his power to give that information upon the subject which I and many other individuals stand much in need of. Let me add, (selfishly I confess) I hope such information will come through the medium of “The Republican,” as I have not an opportunity of seeing “The Trades” newspaper.

F. P. must excuse me in saying that I think the “jargon” of “good in principle and bad in practice,” might have been overlooked by a writer possessing his superior command of language. It seems pretty clear to me that *theory* was intended instead of *principle*; we have heard of many things good in *theory* which did not “*work well*,” ask the shareholders of the late bubble companies.

I repeat, Sir, that, conditionally, I am not an enemy to machinery: but I must see it employed to reduce the sum of human labour, with a view to ameliorate the condition of the biped beasts of burthen, and to increase the comforts of the industrious multitude. I condemn it only as employed to enrich and aggrandize monopolizing and ambitious individuals, and to enable the nation to support an unjust and unnecessary load of fiscal imposition.

A few more words and I have done. Mr. Single may or may not be “ignorant” or “wayward;” there may be many journey-men mechanics who labour from five in the morning till seven in the evening for a bare subsistence, and many who in a shorter space of time earn sufficient to enable them to be “much better dressed and much more *genteel in their conduct*, than their employers were formerly:” these things do not seem to me material to our enquiry; which is whether scientific and literary knowledge be beneficial to operative mechanics; and, if so, whether the “Institutions” offer the best means of obtaining it. I am of opinion that knowledge is decidedly beneficial to all: that as F. P. well expresses it, “increase of knowledge produces increase of self respect,” and I believe further that knowledge will ultimately annihilate the lingering relics of feudal tyranny and

monkish superstition; I flatter myself that our posterity will be enabled to

“Walk erect and free,  
As God and Nature meant mankind should be;  
When Reason shall no longer blindly bow  
To the vile pagod things that o'er her brow,  
Like him of Juggernaut, drive trampling now.  
Nor conquest dare to desolate God's earth;  
Nor drunken victory with a Nero's mirth,  
Strike her lewd harp amidst a people's groans:  
But, built on love, the world's exalted thrones  
Shall to the virtuous and the wise be given—  
Those bright, those sole, legitimates of heaven.”

But, Sir, to be cool—which is no easy matter in this warm weather, and with such a subject before us, admitting knowledge to be beneficial to all, do the “institutions” afford the most eligible means of attaining it? I think they do not. They are decidedly to be preferred to public houses for the employment of a leisure hour, but lectures are generally very dull and soporific commodities: even when the lecturer uses the plainest terms, and possesses the most engaging manner, it is impossible to secure the attention of all; but, as is generally the case, when he expresses his meaning in terms of art, perfectly intelligible to himself (sometimes) and to his learned coadjutors, but infinitely obscure to those who have only perused the horn-book of science, I fear the advantage to the hearers (sleepers included) is very small indeed.

Chemistry and Algebra are doubtless very useful sciences to some persons, but there are many things much more important to the general student, even in the walks of life superior to that of the journeyman mechanic: a man may be a good husband, father, tradesman, merchant, legislator or ruler without understanding either. Do not mistake me, Sir, I would not decry any branch of knowledge, or any useful institution, but lecturers and teachers are too apt to prefer the *shewy* to the substantial; and I am convinced that they who would thoroughly understand any art or science, must not be content with the harangues of professors, but must *work at* it themselves.

Great names and sounding appellations are very imposing. Institution—College—University—Oxford—Cambridge—Eton—Harrow—there seems to be something very classical in the very stones and mortar of which their walls are compounded: let me not be illiberal, many good and learned men have been educated in such places, but for every such a one there have been a hundred empty-headed fops and conceited pedants. The great mass of those who are really well informed and useful members of society have been, like F. P. self-instructed, except in the very rudiments of learning.



And to digress a little from the subject, what is that boasted *classical* learning which is often so triumphantly thrust in the face of the mere English scholar? Have we not English Classics? Is it not more honourable to speak and write your own language well, than to have a confused smattering of the defunct languages of the robbers and murderers of antiquity? Is it probable that Demosthenes and Cicero would ever have attained their splendid celebrity had they not cultivated their own tongue in preference to others? But I fear I shall tire the patience of F. P. he must by this time be ready to ask me what plan I have to propose as likely to be more beneficial to the operative mechanics than the "Institutions?" I frankly answer none, and must expect to be put in the *caviller's* box with Mr. Single. I have however given my mite; perhaps hereafter I may be enabled to give something more: I have not, like the braggart Cobbett, a bill ready cut and dried, and sealed up in a strong box, which would in an instant redress all grievances, and supply all deficiencies, but I have an indistinct day-dream—a conception of something, that, should time and circumstances permit, may hereafter not be thought undeserving of notice. For the present, I will content myself with saying to the operative mechanics, attend the lectures and the schools of the Institutions, and other means of acquiring knowledge as much as circumstances and inclination permit; but above all things follow the example of F. P. instruct yourselves, be sober, be persevering, be diligent, "get knowledge; above all things get knowledge."

Aug. 1, 1826.

J. F.

---

#### TO MR. RICHARD CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

July 8, 1826.

The enclosed Subscription was begun last July. Being then in prison, it was intended for you and your imprisoned shopmen. The Union Room was at that time discontinued, and the seats sold to the Mechanics' Institution in this town. It was agreed that £2. 11s. 9d. should be given to you and your incarcerated shopmen, as a grateful acknowledgment for your unjust suffering in the cause of truth, being one moiety of their value; and the other to be given to the Mechanics' Institute. The above sum was paid into the hands of Mr. Edward Hague of Duckenfield, near Ashton-under-line, a man of some landed property, and acting constable of that place. This was to have been sent with the subscriptions of the persons who have here subscribed their mites. He hath been often solicited to send it, but hath not yet thought it proper. Not being able to get it from him, after waiting so

long, to satisfy the subscribers, I herewith transmit to you that portion committed to my care, being the sum of £1. 14s. 9d.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES WALKER.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Joseph Hibbert	1	0	Robert Bottomly	2	6
James Hadfield	0	6	John Shaw	1	0
Thomas Hartley	3	0	John Buckley	0	6
Samuel Hadfield	0	6	A Friend	0	6
John Buckley	0	6	Henry Falconer	1	0
James Crossley	0	6	Ogden Knott	0	6
James Dransfield	0	6	John Higson	1	0
James Worrall	0	6	Charles Walker	2	6
James Millan	1	0	Thsma Cook	2	6
John Walker	0	6	Jonas Robinson	1	0
Edward Hall	1	0	John Noble	0	6
Richard Smith	0	6	L. Worthington	0	6
John Hadfield	0	6	James Fielding	0	8
Abel Thomlinson	0	2	Solomon Norton	0	6
W. G.	0	6	John Cook	0	6
James Tennant	0	6	Abram Winterbottom	0	6
Robert Hulsey	0	6	Jervais Lawton	0	6
Abel Hyde	2	6	A Friend to Truth	0	6
Wm. Boardman	1	0	Aaron Cheetham	6	6
W. S.	1	0	Robert Lawton	0	6
John Wood	1	0	Joshua Hobson	1	0

*Note.*—Mr. Hague must be left to his own feelings after this publication, and the sure reproach which will fall upon him. Robbery at all times is a crime; but to rob a prisoner who suffers not from crime but his virtue in resisting the mandates of tyranny, is to be a villain indeed.

The Newgate Magazine will not be carried beyond the second volume, which has been completed with this month of August. Sets may be completed, and the two volumes will be on sale in boards at 10s. each. The following general list of subscriptions and subscribers to those who were arrested in 1824 was intended for but could find no room in the last number of "The Newgate Magazine." It is particularly requested, if there be any outstanding subscriptions, that they be closed and sent in as early as possible, as the persons now confined, Clarke, Campion, and Perry, have felt a falling off of public support for some time past. They are now much more comfortable by the change from Newgate to the Compter, can see their friends to more satisfaction, and it is to be hoped, that they will not be allowed to want the comforts which a few shillings weekly will add to their prison allowance, during the short remainder of their imprisonment. For myself, I can say truly, that I have no money, and am likely to have none of my own, in the course of the next year, to give them,

R. C.



*Total Amount of Money received during the Confinement of each Individual, prosecuted in 1824.*

		Public Subscriptions.	Private Donations.	From Mr. Carlile.	Total.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
J. Clarke . . .	{ from May 17, 1824 to July 27, 1826 .	28 14 9	12 10 6	2 3 3	43 8 6
W. Haley . . .	{ from May 21, 1824 to March 28, 1826 .	16 10 5	6 2 6	1 17 0	2 9 11
M. O'Connor .	{ from May 21, 1824 to Dec. 2, 1824 . .	3 8 7	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 8 7
J. Christopher .	{ from May 22, 1824 to Nov. 21, 1824 . .	6 11 7	1 0 0	1 17 0	9 8 7
W. Cochrane .	{ from May 27, 1824 to Dec. 2, 1824 . .	6 3 10	3 12 6	1 17 0	11 13 4
R. Hassell . .	{ from May 27, 1824 to June 2, 1826 . .	27 8 10	6 16 3	2 3 3	36 8 4
T. R. Perry . .	{ from May 31, 1824 to July 29, 1826 . .	33 8 9	15 11 0	2 3 3	51 3 0
T. Jeffrys . . .	{ from June 7, 1824 to Dec. 2, 1825 . .	23 17 4	9 4 0	1 17 0	34 18 4
W. Champion .	{ from June 7, 1824 to July 29, 1826 . .	28 4 0	9 8 6	2 3 3	39 15 9

CONTINUED LOVES OF THE BLACK-GUARDS AND  
THE RED-GUARDS OF CHURCH AND STATE.

BOW STREET.—In “The Morning Chronicle” of Tuesday last, we gave an account of the apprehension of a person calling himself *George Smythe*, who resided at Hodson’s Hotel, Piazza, Covent Garden, and a *Corporal Finlay*, of the 3d Guards, charged with committing an atrocious offence on Friday night last, in Scotland Yard, Whitehall. We then stated, that we had reason to believe that *George Smythe* was an assumed name, and that the accused was a man of some rank in society. Yesterday the said G. Smythe and the Soldier were again brought before Mr. Minshall; and another witness, a writer to a conveyancer, in Cursitor-street, Chancery-lane, gave some further evidence against them. The Magistrate, on directing the commitment of the prisoners, on Tuesday night, ordered the parties to give notice of bail. On Tuesday, two persons—a Mr. Simpson, of the South Sea House, and a Mr. Gooding, of Bath, a gentleman of the legal profession—gave in their names as bail for the person who said his name was Smythe, but whose real name and address is THE REV. MR. G. GOOLD, of DORCHESTER. The bail being deemed sufficient, they having replied satisfactorily to the usual questions, the Rev. Gentleman was set at liberty. The Rev. Gentleman gave bail himself in £500 and two sureties in £200 each.

The Soldier, not being provided with bail, was sent to the House of Correction, to await his trial.

---

There are two towns of Dorchester, one in Dorsetshire and the other in Oxfordshire, and as I do not recollect hearing of the name of Goold, as a clergyman, while at Dorchester, in Dorset, I cannot connect this fellow with my late persecutors in that town. But we have some evidence of my description of their characters, in what has passed through the papers concerning their conduct toward some little boys, whom the Reverend George Chamberlain of Wyke frightened into an acknowledgement that they had taken some of his apples. Some of them, mere infants, were sent to the tread-mill! One for three months, others for a month and some for a week.

Dr. England, the Archdeacon of Dorset, an ignorant, bitter, unfeeling old fellow, said, that these three boys were apple stealers because they were not regularly sent to church. I can inform the Doctor, that orchards are so common and so public in some parts of Devonshire, that the boys go very regularly to church, and go to and fro from church to the orchard for apples, twice or thrice in the course of a service: so this is a case in point, that there is no influence in the liturgy of the church to keep boys from entering an orchard to take apples. In that part of the country, a boy's taking an apple is looked upon with the same feeling as to see a bird on a tree pecking at it. Boys and birds are alike driven with a halloo.

R. C.

---

#### JOINT STOCK BOOK COMPANY.

---

THAT this company will be successfull, I have never doubted. Its present stock is of twice the value of the money deposited to create it, and now that we have the conveniences, a rapid progress will be made. The unfinished state of house and printing office leave us some impediments; but another week or two at the farthest will wear them out.

---

#### ERRATUM.

Mr. WALKER, keeper of the Coffee House, in Primrose Street, who permits occasional political and theological discussions in his house, wishes me to say, that the company attending his house cannot be fairly said to be a branch of the Christian Evidence Society. In apology for my so connecting them, I have to say, that more than one person represented the discussions in Primrose Street to me as a part and parcel of those of the society, or as very like them.

R. C.



## TO THE PUBLIC.

FRIENDS, BRETHREN, AND COUNTRYMEN,

THE subject of education is, of all others, the one in which the vital interests of the inhabitants of the British empire are the deepest concerned. Yet, it is melancholy to reflect, that a single step has not yet been taken, even in the cause of elementary education, on a scale proportionable to the population and commensurate to the necessity of a rich, populous, and rapidly increasing people. So far from this being the case, I am inclined to think that there is not a single parish in the empire that can boast of good elementary schools sufficient for the education of the tenth part of its population. Nor have I yet, in the course of sixteen years' experience as teacher, in every quarter of the globe, found one well-conducted school in which a general system of education had been reduced to practice, on a scale suitable to the necessities of a large private family. Indeed, if I may judge of the present state of education from my experience in London during the last three years, the barriers that oppose the progress of education seem to be insurmountable. Nor can they be overthrown, unless by the energy of a people accustomed to think and to act steadily for themselves. As long as the cause of education rests with those who are interested in its suppression—as long as the people give the reward of faithful services to visionary speculators, who only repay them with bombastic accounts of their labours in foreign countries—as long as it continues the practice to give the reward of patient merit to those who do not actually labour in the great cause of education, and to deny both food and raiment to those who do—so long the cause of education must retrograde; and whilst it retrogrades, the taxes of this overburthened country must of necessity continually increase, until at length, the power of providing for your children's education, and of delivering yourselves from the common ruin, will be utterly taken out of your hands. Then, indeed, you will have orators to boast of British freedom! You will have men to tell you of the progress of the Gospel in foreign parts, and of the prosperity of Sion in the deserts of Africa! You will have "Bethel Unions" and innumerable other unions, which require no great degree of labour on the parts of their advocates, which confer but imaginary benefits on those for whose advantage they are ostensibly formed, but which are, in point of fact, snug sinecures for some of their zealous promoters. These institutions, hitherto called charitable, with public amusements and the flattery of the press, which continually speaks of this enlightened age, will divert your attention from the primary subject, until at length, to your un-

No. 4. Vol. 14.

speakable (I will not presumptuously say eternal) grief, you find your children grown to a state of manhood with their minds unenlightened. They are then fit subjects to endure despotism; to laud the power which deprives them of bread; and which, not only withholds the fruits of their labour from themselves, but presents them with the appalling view of their perishing parents, whose misery the energy of their bodies will then be unable to alleviate. Such is the picture of human misery to which millions in the British empire have arrived; such the picture of human misery to which millions in Europe are hastening! Nor can any thing or any single power arrest the progress of devastation but the wisdom of the people, and their united energy in the recovery of their rights, and their continued firmness in the maintenance of them. But, my fellow-sufferers, it is not by violence that these rights are to be recovered; it is not by revolutionary means they are to be maintained. No! such steps would only tend to the support of despotism; of that despotism which has robbed the free born sons of England of their bread, and, to use the language of Scripture, taken their children's bread and given it to the dogs!

What remedy, then, you will naturally ask, can we have? I answer, that you yet possess one, a slow but sure remedy, which if universally adopted, will enable England to lift her sinking head, and to maintain a character for freedom not inferior to that enjoyed by states governed by just senators. Yes, if you struggle to acquire the habit of thinking for yourselves, you will then naturally acquire the power of acting. But, until such time as you do this, you must continually, of necessity, lose more and more of your substance, until, at last, slavery, rendered horrible by famine, will be your lot! Oh! think not that this is a vivid picture of my own imagination, or that I am one of the pampered sons of Ease, who wishes to excite your indignation, that you may fall victims to the legal authorities, to the power you have raised up, and now maintain in voluptuousness, whilst thousands, nay, millions of virtuous Britons are actually famishing! No, my beloved fellow-sufferers, I have long since reached the goal of misery! I have spent years in wretchedness, horrible beyond expression; and it is only to guard you against the approaching danger, that I raise my warning voice. To every Englishman, who would wish to preserve what yet of the Constitution that is worthy of his attachment remains, I would say, that, if we do not sink into absolute slavery, it must be owing to education. Not education on the modern system of darkening the human understanding, and calling that darkness, divine inspiration; not education that makes an acquaintance with figurative riddles to constitute the foundation of your knowledge; no, but that education that teaches you to know the sovereignty of the people, and to preserve among yourselves, for your consumption, the substance



produced by the industry of the agriculturist and of the operative. You have the example of kings before you, who have taught every age to know, from William, the liberal Norman, down to the present day—that power is justice. What, then, have you next to learn but that numbers, which maintain abused power, constitute that power. Yes! It is the people who are, *ipso facto*, the great power; the power that supports all burthens, that fights all battles, and that makes every sacrifice for the support of this empire, in which the supporters can recognize no privileges but the privileges of supporting all the burthens of the State, as aforementioned; and of bearing the brunt of every battle or war into which the country is, has, or may be driven by the wickedness or ignorance of Ministers, who never experience the inconvenience, the misery with which they overwhelm the empire. Mines have been drained of their wealth, nations have been immolated on the altars of faction, and rivers have been swoln with the blood of the slain in Christian countries, for the real purpose of rivetting perpetually the chains of slavery on free-born man! An age was spent in sanguinary war, we were said to conquer, that conquest was called glory: but now, in the twelfth year of peace, we find, to the amazement of civilized man, that our boasted glory is the privilege of supporting national burthens, that are sinking millions into premature graves! This is the glory for which we support monarchy; this is the prize with which our loyalty to a King, who does not commiserate the sufferings of his people, has been rewarded! This is the glorious state of freedom the valour of our arms has purchased!

England, that proudly vaunts of giving freedom to other nations, is herself the sovereign of an empire enslaved! Her sinews of war are shrunken; and the aged veterans who fought her battles, as well as their helpless offspring, are perishing of famine, the glorious fruits of conquest! Oh, God! Is this the mistress of the world, the encourager of arts and sciences, in which famine, rapacious famine, destroys the producers of plenty? Is this the boasted mistress of the world, which contains a Clergy and a Nobility, who, like the lilies of the valley, toil not, neither do they spin, yet they are arrayed in splendour, and they feed voluptuously, whilst the producers of their luxuries perish of want? Yes, this is the great Ruler of nations; whilst she is unwilling to give bread to her own artizans, she is madly prosecuting a war in the remotest corner of the globe, that she may absorb the labour of the peaceful inhabitants of India? Good God! Are these the works of thy disciples? Didst thou ever commission a people to preach a doctrine that they do not believe or practise? But why do I use the apostrophe? Why do I ask a question that nature answers? The book of Nature is the only revelation of the will of the Deity! And all written books that explain that will any

other way than on the principles of universal justice, benevolence, and wisdom, are the effects of enthusiasm, madness, or hypocrisy. God works not by partial, but by general laws. His power is unlimited, and his rules are immutable; that power has given to the inhabitants of this earth riches abundant. The inexhaustible stores of the earth and sea are more than sufficient continually to afford to man every comfort that his health requires, and every necessary that his numerous life-springing progeny requires. But man, civilized and rapacious, with a degree of selfishness disgraceful to any tribe of the brute creation, claims for a few members of the great family of the universe the whole of this globe, that God made for the support of its inhabitants! Well, these favoured sons of Fortune have got the land divided amongst themselves. What use do they make of it? They do not cultivate it. No, they must have slaves to cultivate it, and these slaves cannot make it produce sufficient to satiate their luxurious masters! More than its produce, in many instances, is extorted from the cultivator, yet all, all is not enough to gratify the idle sons of pampered greatness! Innumerable are the plans laid to reduce man to poverty and distress, and to retain him in misery and degradation. They have succeeded; the free-born sons of England are now objects of compassion, not to the Americans only, but to the Jamaica slaves! Good God! Have the legislators who brought on us these calamities no sense of shame? Are they not endowed with natural feelings of pride like other men? Will the Nobles of our land for ever revel in luxury, whilst the producers of that luxury and their famishing families are objects of compassion, even to West Indian slaves? Oh yes! It is an axiom with the Legislature, that every conquered rebellion doubly fortifies the State against which it was raised. Hence, insatiable avarice cannot be satisfied with the utmost the people can pay, though that payment exceeds by twentyfold what a moderate Government would require; hence the foundation of rebellions are laid, and rebellions are often matured by the Government itself, which raises the armies for that purpose. This is precisely the state in which we were placed in the last rebellion; that sanguinary conflict in which the sons of Erin fell in countless numbers; in which the sword of the son pierced the breast of the father, and the spear of the father entered the sides of his children! Famine, war, confusion, dire beyond expression, with a countless train of evils, chased the inhabitants of that land from one end of the island to the other; and when human nature indignantly strove to divest itself of some of the weighty chains that Despotism had forged for it, the tyrants arrayed their armies against the defenceless, and thus forced them to arm in their own defence! The bloodhounds of war once let loose, cities smoked, villages burst into flames, and legal murder slew its thousands



and tens of thousands ! Devastation was called loyalty ; and the earth was drunk with the blood of the peacefully-disposed agriculturists, who but for the political intrigues of statesmen, would have lived in peace, and would have died surrounded by their friends in the peaceful cottage. But the eye tires, surveying the fields of blood that flowed to gratify the ambitious projectors of war. The world was then deeper sunk in ignorance than it is now ; Priestcraft, the sacred tool of Ministers, had then an unlimited range of authority over the human mind. It could satisfy a man's conscience, making him believe that it was meritorious to cut his neighbour's throat because he wore such a coloured handkerchief. But the dark age of this party-coloured religion is gone by for ever ! We see churchmen of every creed exempt from the common trials of humanity ; they are arrayed in purple and fine linen ; they fare sumptuously every day ; and the present political state of affairs recognizes but two ranks, the exceeding rich and the extremely poor. Whilst the country is groaning under the most intolerable burthens, in mockery of the public opinion, deriding the cause of perishing humanity, his Majesty's Commissioners are adding millions to the national expence by the erection of new churches ! Great God ! Art thou pleased with that sacrifice which is made in erecting temples to thy honour at the expence of famishing millions ? Can the blood-stained offering be acceptable to that Deity who is all purity ; whose most glorious attribute is universal beneficence, and whose beneficence to the destruction of famishing thousands is in the erection of these temples *perverted* ? No ! such works always were, always will be a mockery, a solemn mockery of the Deity, as well as a national robbery of all ranks who contribute to them.

But, my beloved fellow-sufferers, the misery we endure, the degradation we are loaded with, arise, in the first instance, from the voluntary surrender of our minds to the guidance of weak or wicked men. Religion ranks as the commander-in-chief, who marshalls innumerable hosts, in all ages and in every country, against the divine gift that God to man bestows, namely, reason. Man, forgetful of the dignity of his nature, and of the natural privileges he should enjoy, being taught to despise what *alone* can make him hold his pre-eminence over the other creatures of the earth, loses by imperceptible degrees this sacred guide ! A false and spurious system of education is imposed upon him ; he is taught to revere his fellow-man, and to almost pay him divine honour ; he is taught to believe that God is capricious, cruel, and unjust, a being who created and is continually creating *beings* for the purpose of making them miserable ; to believe that man is himself hell-deserving, and by divine justice only entitled to suffer eternal tortures. Such are the lessons instilled into the minds of youth, but oh ! for what purpose ? I will tell you, my fellow-

sufferers, for the purpose of making the human race tamely submit to every burthen that senates may impose. They who claim hereditary privileges over their fellow-creatures, strictly enjoin us to *fear God—to honour the King*. But why should God be feared? He is a being of infinite goodness; and therefore he commands the love of the universe. His most glorious attribute is beneficence, by which he has made a rich provision for all the inhabitants of the earth. Its eternally varying surface, its fruitful, teeming womb, its inexhaustible mines abounding with innumerable comforts of life, the deep caverns of the sea, the immeasurable extent of fruitful oceans—all, all from pole to pole around this glorious orb form the universal estate, to which, by God's law, by the immutable law of nature, every industrious and ingenious man is entitled. Labour is the only purchase-money that nature demands in return for these inexhaustible treasures, that are sufficient through countless ages yet to come to spread health, cheerfulness, and abundance, through myriads of millions of happy human creatures yet unborn. But look, my brave, enlightened brother slaves! look at what man has done for the human race; he has exalted his fellow-creatures to the rank of Kings: he has formed a Nobility, established a Clergy, and proclaimed from pole to pole that none but the idle and voluptuous shall taste the riches of nature, that none but the useful, the virtuous and industrious shall feel the extremes of want! These are the glories of slavery, of that slavery which we sometimes, (striving to cheat our understanding) vile sycophants as we sometimes are, celebrate as British freedom! Yourselves are famishing; your children are dying of want! In the midst of plenty, the breasts of the mother are dry, through want of nourishment; the babe sickens and dies at the breast; the sinews of the labourer's arms are dried up; and in the harvest season Want is slaying its thousands and tens of thousands!

Such, oh! my beloved fellow-slaves, is the frightful state of your agriculturist, your labourer, and your innumerable hosts of tradesmen! But, are these miseries felt by the rich? Do the Kings of Europe, or the proud Aristocracies, which have robbed and enslaved the human race partake of our wants? Do they experience any of the evils with which our parents, wives, and tender offspring are afflicted? No, no! they are of Royal and of noble blood; to pamper each of these a thousand children and four hundred parents at least must starve! This is the state of misery that princely power has entailed on the world. Surrounded by abundance, every luxury and every life-nourishing necessary is the property of the Lords of the creation only! In recompence for these privations, we are governed by them! Excellent Governors! wise and prudent Administrators! the dying song of nations is faintly chaunting your hymns of praise! the



eyes of famishing millions are turned towards you! and the thanks of an expiring nation, of that nation that you have beggared, is continually ringing the death peal in your ears!!!

MICHAEL ROUGH, Schoolmaster.

33, Brownlow Street,  
Drury Lane.

---

### ON THE POOR LAWS.

---

A PERIOD of distress is the most proper time to agitate all questions of importance to the labouring class, because at such a time men are more inclined to pay attention to them. Population, Poor Laws, Corn Laws, and Free Trade, are subjects which ought now to be canvassed in every periodical publication; while the evil, the distress of a large portion of our fellow-men, meets our eye in one page, the causes and projected remedies should appear in the next.

The founders of the present system of Poor Laws supposed that no man ought to suffer want, and these laws were made to secure means of subsistence to all. At the present day the general belief is that these laws will, at least, prevent absolute want of the necessaries of life; and they are moreover lauded as composing a very charitable system. In the following pages I shall endeavour to show:—First, that they were founded on an absurd supposition as to their necessity; and in this section I think I shall be able to prove that to legislate to compel one man to furnish the means of subsistence for another is an act, not of charity, but of injustice. Secondly, that these laws were designed to accomplish what they never could nor ever can accomplish; but on the contrary that their direct tendency is to extend the evil they were designed to destroy. Thirdly, that these laws may be repealed without injuring the happiness or prosperity of the people, although many assert that this cannot be effected but by the most dreadful sacrifices. And lastly, that there are measures, independent of legislation, which, if adopted and carried into execution, would in part, if not wholly, answer the purpose for which the Poor Laws were constructed.

1. These laws were founded on a supposition that no one ought to be allowed to suffer want: and this, of course, includes the supposition that want could be prevented by legislation; that is, in other words, that every man has a just claim upon the community of which he is a member for the means of subsistence when he cannot obtain them by labour; that the community are in justice bound to supply him; and that they can do so at all times.

I shall first dispute the right here claimed, which I cannot do better than by asking a question. On what is this right founded? Can any one show why he ought to be supplied with the necessities of life when he cannot procure them by labour? Let me not be understood as saying that a man in distress ought not to be relieved: I am only endeavouring to show that he has no right to such relief. Charity is a noble feeling; it does honour to the breast which contains it, and, when properly directed, is highly beneficial to society; but the sufferings of our fellow-men, when we are forced to relieve them, do not awaken this feeling, but on the contrary they deaden or destroy it: nor do those who receive the relief feel any gratitude for it, because they have been led to believe it their right; and instead of thanking their benefactors, they generally curse them as penurious, under an impression that the givers withhold a portion of that to which the receivers have a just claim. A real charity produces fine feelings, pleasurable sensations, both with the giver and receiver; but a forced charity produces the contrary feeling: the first helps to bind, the last to separate, society.

In order to prove the non-existence of the right to support, I will endeavour to show the progress of a community in the production of paupers. Suppose a number of people to inhabit an Island, and that they equally divide the land and support themselves by their labour. Here the right of each man is that and that only which his own portion of land produces, and which may be more or less according to his knowledge and industry. His only claim on the community is that this right of property may be kept inviolable; and his duty to secure the same right to every other. It is clear that this right of property is the foundation of all good laws in every community, and that when governments were first formed they were solely for its protection, each member of the community paying his share to support the executive, whose duty it was to protect the rights of all.

Now suppose that one man neglected to cultivate his land and wanted the means of subsistence, what could he allege in support of his claim to subsistence from others? He could only say, "I want," and his neighbours would reply, "Go then and labour as others do; those who are idle deserve to suffer want." They would certainly not encourage idleness by giving relief. But suppose another in want, from sickness or accident, and it is almost as certain that relief would be afforded. These are the first paupers, and our mischievous system of Poor Laws *promises* a provision for *both*.

Let us suppose a few generations passed away, and then look at this community again. Some families have not increased their numbers, and still possess the first share of land undivided; others have doubled them, have divided their lands, and by hard labour are able to gain a subsistence; others have increased



so rapidly and divided their lands into such small portions that the utmost labour they can bestow upon them will not procure themselves a sufficiency to support life. These last will say, "We want," and those who have been more careful respecting their families, those who possess the means of a comfortable subsistence, will, or ought, to reply, "Your want is the necessary consequence of the conduct of your forefathers, and, however painful it may be not to do so, if we relieve you we shall soon reduce ourselves to the same state that you are in." The want, unrelieved, would produce disease and death, which would remove the redundanoy, and the survivors having had such experience of the ill effects of intemperate breeding would most probably imitate the conduct of their more cautious neighbours. On the contrary, suppose our system in full force, compelling those who have, to supply those who have not, and all would soon be reduced to one state; all would want, and nothing but the concomitant evils of want could place any of them within the reach of the means to support life. Why the Poor Laws have not had this effect in this country I shall show in the next section. The above is a pretty correct picture of the state of every community at some period or other of its existence; and I think it bears me out in saying that it is not an act of charity to promise or endeavour to support a redundant population when its effect must be to increase the evil, and that to attempt to compel any one to do so is a gross act of injustice, as it deprives him of the advantages of his own and others previous good conduct.

We often hear men prating about an equal division of land, on the supposition that every man has an equal claim to it. If a number of men were to go out from this or any other country to take possession of an uninhabited island, this claim would be just; but in an old established community it is not so. Let us follow up the progress of our supposed community, and we shall find that it leads to the same state of things, the same monopoly of the good things in the hands of a few persons, as at present exists. When some of the estates became so divided that one portion would not produce the means of subsistence, it is a natural consequence that some will sell their shares to those who can supply their immediate wants. Now those shares can only be purchased by those who have before more than a sufficiency for their own cultivation. The men who thus sell their birthright have no more claim on the land; they have their labour to offer and nothing more, and if they can sell this sufficiently high they have the means of subsistence. This labour will not sell except it will produce more than what it costs: those who buy it do so to gain something, to ease themselves of some portion of their usual labour, or to obtain more of the comforts of life. Here commences the distinctions in society, of master and ser-

vant, of rich and poor; and while population keeps a-head of the demand for labour, this distinction will still go on increasing. Some may ask, But have not the children of these men a right to a portion of the land they are born upon? I answer most certainly not. They have only a claim on their fathers' possessions, and these were previously sold. The father gives his son life, and, if he can, strength to labour, and he has nothing more to give, they nothing more which they can justly claim. Where then is the labourer's right to support when he cannot obtain it by the sweat of his brow? Where is the foundation of the doctrine that no one ought to want?

2. The Poor Laws were intended to prevent want, to provide for distress whenever it was to be found. Had the founders of these laws understood the principle of population it is not probable that they would have undertaken what they did; they would have acted so much in opposition to the happiness of mankind when there was no immediate good result to be obtained by it; but supposing them ignorant, which they certainly were, of this great regulating law, they may be considered as having been actuated by the most charitable views and good intentions toward their fellow-men. It is my present purpose to show that they attempted what could not be performed, at least, what their system of laws could not perform.

In the first place I will state a few particulars respecting the establishment of Poor Laws. Before these laws were made, distress could only find relief in private charities; but this fund was not so insignificant as may now be supposed, for besides what came immediately from the purses of the charitable living, many charitable endowments had been made by deceased persons; and moreover the income of the clergy, which had principally arisen from the gifts of religious and charitable persons, was partly applied to relieve the wants of the poor. According to Blackstone, "at the first establishment of parochial clergy, the tithes of the parish were distributed in a fourfold division; one for the use of the bishop, another for maintaining the fabric of the church, a *third for the poor*, and a fourth to provide for the incumbent; and when the sees of the bishops became otherwise amply endowed, they were prohibited from demanding their usual share, and the division was in three parts only." But it does not appear that the clergy made it a rule to give a third, fourth, or any exact skare; they discriminately relieved the wants of their parishioners, and kept the rest for themselves, and to beautify their churches. When Henry the Eighth effected the "Glorious Revolution," this portion of the poor's fund was taken away from them, and the consequences soon appeared: the number of the poor increased; but to prevent so many from begging, the Justices of the Peace were empowered to prevent all such persons as appeared capable of earning a livelihood from begging, and to



grant a licence to beg to all such as had no resource but charity to obtain subsistence. Laws were also made to punish what they denominated vagabonds,—some of them, doubtless, fellows who would rather beg than work, but many of them persons who could not obtain employment,—for the first offence by whipping and the loss of a part of one ear, and if afterwards taken wandering in idleness to be adjudged and executed as felon. From Henry to Elizabeth but little was done by way of legislation to affect the labouring class: some very severe punishments threatened for idleness, but they do not appear to have been put in force. Shortly after Elizabeth came to the throne, the state of the poor was more attended to, and many statutes respecting them were enacted; and in the forty-third of her reign was passed the famous Act which laid the foundation of our present system of Poor Laws, entitled “An Act for the Relief of the Poor.” This Act made the support of the poor compulsory; and the term poor now included, not, as heretofore, only the old, blind, and impotent, but all those who were in want, all who could not find an employment nor otherwise earn a subsistence. The absurdity of attempting to make all men industrious by penal laws, seems by this new Act to have been discovered; for the persons who by some of the previous Acts were liable to whipping, were now to be provided for; work was to be procured for all those who were out of employment, and for which they were to receive a sufficient remuneration to place them above want. But this was no more than stepping from one absurdity to another, as I trust by and bye to make evident.

The principle of population teaches us that mankind has a greater tendency to increase than capital, which is the means of their support; and it teaches us also that if the number of births be not restricted, the excess of population above capital will be carried off by want, and its concomitants, disease and death. Now the Poor Laws say that this shall not be the case, that those who want shall be supported. Let us suppose that there are eleven millions of persons in one community, and that the capital of the same country can only give employment to ten millions. It is evident that one million persons will be paupers, and that many who find employment will be paid but barely sufficient to support existence. But this million must be supported. Whence comes the support? From the capital, the already inadequate capital of the country. The immediate result must be an increase of paupers. Suppose a manufacturer has just sufficient capital to give employment to one hundred persons; then suppose him compelled to support a share of the excess of population. I scarcely need state the deduction to be drawn: it is so clearly evident that he must discharge some of his hundred labourers, must add to the number to be relieved.

“But the paupers,” say some, “may be put to work and then

the capital will not be lost." This is a fallacy. The poor cannot be put to work without capital to work upon. Suppose ten manufacturers each having capital sufficient to employ one hundred labourers; and that under the system of Poor Laws it falls to their share to relieve one hundred paupers. We have already seen what would be the effect of immediate relief; let us now see what would be the effect of finding employment. Each master would be taxed in a sum sufficient to support ten paupers; but this would reduce his capital and incapacitate him to employ more than ninety labourers. Thus there would be still a hundred paupers as before; and it is but fair to suppose that the portion of capital under the direction of the overseers would not be as productive as when applied by the real owners; and thus an actual loss would be sustained in the attempt to find employment for the redundant population. My supposed case embraces but a small number of persons, but the same causes would produce the same effects on any community, no matter what its numerical extent.

Thus far I have been showing, theoretically, that the Poor Laws could not accomplish the object for which they were designed: I will now give a practical illustration to the same effect. In the year 1776 the gross assessments under the Poor Laws amounted to £1,529,780. In 1786 to £2,184,904. The average annual expenditure for the poor for ten years prior to 1801 was £3,861,010. The gross assessment for 1802 was £4,952,421. Average expenditure of the years 1812, 1813, and 1814, £5,147,000. I have no account of the assessments under the Poor Laws prior to 1776, but the above statement shows us their tendency to a rapid increase, and it is fair to suppose that they continued to increase from their first establishment. This fact is certain—the poor rates are now enormous, and yet the poor in great distress; and hence we can deduce, that although people may pay heavy taxes to support the poor, that they cannot thereby raise the condition of the great mass of the people, nor prevent want from continually assailing them.

The following statement of the number of deaths compared with the price of corn in seven manufacturing districts of England, will show that want sometimes visits our cottages, and what is its effect on the population:—

Years.	Wheat per quarter.	Deaths.
1801	113s. 3d.	55,964.
1804	60s. 1d.	44,794.
1807	73s. 3d.	48,108.
1810	106s. 2d.	54,864.

Here is a difference of mortality of one in five, evidently caused by want; and this happens in England, a country of which it is



often said that not one of its inhabitants need suffer from a want of the means of subsistence!

Let it be granted that an excess of population, or, which is the same thing under another view, a deficiency of employment for all those who have to obtain a livelihood by labour, is the cause of want among the people; and it will be easy to show that the Poor Laws must extend the evil they were designed to check.

These laws, in the first place, encourage early marriages among the poorest sort of labourers. Men who are as low in the scale of existence as they can possibly be, cannot be supposed to possess *much* of that moral restraint which prevents others in better circumstances from marrying till they can support a family; but it is reasonable to suppose that a large portion even of such as these would possess caution and restraint sufficient, if there were no poor laws to promise a support for whatever number of children they may happen to produce. It is a well known fact that marriages are more frequent and early among agricultural and such other labourers as are badly remunerated, than among those who obtain a comfortable subsistence. It is easily accounted for: the latter do not look to the Poor Laws, they calculate only on the produce of their own labour, and do not marry without an *apparent* prospect of being able to support a family; but the former think nothing of their own capability, they look to the parish fund for relief when needed, and marry without a thought of the extra misery they are bringing upon themselves, or of the crime of producing a number of beings to add to the misery of mankind. There are exceptions, there are some among the higher order of labourers who have no caution, and some among the lower who will forego every sensual gratification rather than produce beings to be as miserable as themselves; still the rule holds good, and shows the mischievous operation of the system we are examining.

These laws also encourage idleness and improvidence. An industrious and provident labourer may put by a sufficiency of his earnings to make himself a member of a Benefit Society, and thus ensure the means of subsistence in sickness or old age; but the poor laws promise the same to the idle and improvident. Where, then, is the inducement to be industrious and saving? It is no wonder that economy is banished from our cottages since its usefulness is no longer visible. It does not, I imagine, require an argument to prove that idleness and improvidence must increase the evil which the Poor Laws were designed to check.

From all these showings of the evil tendency of the Poor Laws, it may appear that more marked effects ought to have transpired, seeing that they have been in operation between two and three hundred years. The fact is, that they never were, because they never could be, carried into *full* operation; and it is from this cause that they have lived so long, for had all been done which

they promised to do, every man would have been, long ere this, a pauper, and consequently the laws of no avail. In spite of the Poor Laws want has carried off the redundant population, and will continue to do so, in spite of all laws, all the measures which the ingenuity of man can devise.

3. It is supposed by many who are aware of the bad consequences arising from the Poor Laws, that they cannot now be repealed, that the attempt would be ruinous to the country. The Committee of Mendicity, in the Constitutional Assembly of France, speaking of the ill effects of our system of Poor Laws, said, "But this example is a great and important lesson for us, for independently of the vast expence, the necessary encouragement of idleness, and the many vices which it presents to us, it discovers to us the most devouring disease in the English Constitution, which to attempt to remove or to allow to remain is equally dangerous for its tranquillity." For my own part, I think it may be done without danger to the existing government, and with a certainty of producing ultimate good to the community at large. I would not advocate an immediate cessation of the operation of the Poor Laws, but a gradual withdrawing, so as to effect none of those who have been led to depend upon them for assistance. An act should be passed declaring that all persons born after such a date should have no claim on the Poor Laws. Besides this, directions should be given to all clergymen throughout the kingdom to explain to their congregations the necessity of this change; and also to teach, by frequent discourses, so much of the science of political economy as relates to the regulation of the price of labour, and to explain, by familiar illustrations, the advantages to be obtained, both individually and generally, by restricting the number of children in each family. Let such a repeal of the Poor Laws take place, and no ruinous, nothing but beneficial effects could follow.

Lastly. A few years previous to the passing of the celebrated act which laid the foundation of the present system of Poor Laws, an act was passed which prohibited the building of cottages unless four acres of ground were laid to each of them, together with a prohibition against more families or households than one inhabiting each cottage. Had this act been strictly enforced, and the compulsory-relief act never passed, it is pretty certain that this country would never have suffered a tenth part of what it has. This act relating to cottages is one of the very few of ancient times calculated to raise the condition of the labouring class; but it is not probable that those who made it understood what it was calculated to effect, or they never would have passed a compulsory-relief act, making it imperative on overseers to find house-room for all who wanted. Had this act been in full force a man could not have married and begun rearing a family till some old family had dropped away; and such a restraint



would have effectually kept the population within bounds. The only good feature in our present system that it effects, is a partial restraint in this way: fearing an increase of settlements upon their parish, the overseers are generally very careful not to allow cottages to be built on waste land. In Ireland every man who has skill and strength enough to build a mud cabin can marry; and hence the Irish generally marry very young, and produce long families. "While this system continues," says a writer on the Principle of Population, "and while a rood of land capable of producing potatoes can be had, the population may continue to increase, and must remain in its present deplorable condition, ill-fed, worse taught, ill-clothed, idle, dirty, ragged, and wretched in the extreme, constantly pressing against the means of subsistence, and occasionally cut down by disease." A measure calculated to prevent these evils must certainly be hailed with pleasure: the philanthropist cannot look on them without shuddering; the man-hater can scarcely wish them more severe.

That putting off marriages to a later period of life would have the effect of restricting the population, is quite evident; but some may ask, Is it humane to compel a man to do so? I reply that any thing is better than to allow him to perpetuate the present wretched system; far better that he should lose a few pleasurable sensations in his youth, than have to live a life of misery in continual dread of being cut off by starvation. But I have said enough before to show that I do not consider even such a sacrifice necessary; he may enjoy every pleasurable sensation which an early attachment and union can afford, and yet go down to old age unencumbered with a numerous progeny. Let the Poor Laws be repealed, and the people taught that their duty does not consist, as they have been long told it did, in giving birth to a long family, but in confining the number of their children to their means of comfortable subsistence, and the labouring class would soon be above the reach of want.

R. H.

---

#### JOHN CLARKE'S "LETTERS TO DR. ADAM CLARKE."

---

I AM upbraided by the author for not noticing these Letters sufficiently in "The Republican," while I, on the other hand, think I have noticed them almost to puffing. It is a difficult matter to please every body, and there are some who will not be pleased on any terms; but if I have neglected to do any thing that I ought to have done for those who have been imprisoned for the sale of my publications, I invite reproach. Whether I have sufficiently

noticed Clarke's Letters, the readers of "The Republican" will each judge for himself. The book has sold well; but because the whole edition has not sold, with a reprint of several Numbers, the author is displeased with me, in not making profit enough of it for myself—and with the public, because they leave any unsold. He should quarrel with his old friend, Maule, for not prosecuting it; that being the best sort of advertisement. He has tried the Recorder, Knowlys, who will not take the book under his judicial protection. If Clarke remains dissatisfied, and no one else will prosecute the book or publisher, I must indict myself or get a friend to do it.

The book is one of the best examinations of the Bible extant. I have repeatedly said this, when once would have been enough for the readers of "The Republican;" but I now recommend it to their notice upon another ground, and that is, if they can push it off among strangers, they will do a double good, in relieving one who at least has encountered persecution and suffered imprisonment from a pure love of the principles which he espoused, while they present a powerful book to a mind impregnated with religious errors.

I am an interested party, and it hardly becomes me to stir in it; but I think that the continued imprisonment of Clarke, Perry, and Campion, should not pass on without receiving every possible mark of public reprobation. The continuation of the sale of the books for which they were prosecuted, the discontinuance of the prosecutions for the last two years, and the liberation of all other persons connected with such publications, make that continued imprisonment a fair subject for bitter and biting reproach upon the King, his Ministers, his Judges, or Legal Advisers, and upon Mr. Peel in particular. To ask or to call for mercy in such a case is to degrade one's self, as well as to degrade the prisoners. To see a vile character like William Haley liberated because he was vile enough to be a lying hypocrite, and to see these men imprisoned because and merely because they will not succumb to hypocrisy, is a very pretty feather in the cap of Mr. Peel or his Masters.

R. C.

---

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 62, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican," to be left at the place of publication.